Please amend the claims to read as indicated in the following list of claims:

1. [Currently amended] A method of defining a common interactions protocol between two entities, the method comprising:

converting syntactic specifications of multiple documents to be passed between the entities, into a skeleton semantic web ontology comprising a set of classes;

~~inputting~~ deriving for each entity a respective set of constraints ~~description of each entity's messaging guidelines, the description~~ including ~~the entity's~~ semantic constraints established by the entity on aspects of the classes of the skeleton ontology ~~on interacting with the other entity~~;

calculating the union of the two sets of constraints ~~descriptions~~;

determining, using a constraint resolver that comprises a description logic reasoner, whether the union is satisfiable, and: ~~using a constraint resolver;~~

where the union is satisfiable, deriving from ~~providing~~ the intersection of the two ~~descriptions~~ sets of constraints a restricted document specification that is compatible with the constraint sets of both entities; ~~as the common interactions protocol if the union is satisfiable;~~ and

where the union is not satisfiable, indicating where any incompatibility lies ~~if the union is not satisfiable~~.

Claim 2. Canceled.

3. [Currently amended] A method according to claim [[2]] 1, wherein the syntactic specifications ~~messaging guidelines~~ are input as XML Schemas.

Claims 4-8. Canceled.

9. [Currently amended] A method according to claim 1, wherein the restricted document specification comprises both a specification of applicable syntactic constraints and a specification of ~~providing step comprises providing a specific subset of the common interactions protocol as a set of~~ applicable semantic constraints ~~constaints~~.

Claims 10-12. Cancelled.

13. [Currently amended] A method according to claim 2, further comprising at least one said entity ~~wherein the inputting step comprises:~~

pre-specifying semantic ~~document~~ constraints and associating them with deployment contexts; ~~in a general way such that they are applicable to a plurality of specific instances/classes of objects/processes; and linking each constraint to a~~

the deriving of the set of constraints for that entity comprising defining a particular deployment context for the common interactions protocol, and

determining which of the pre-specified semantic constraints are applicable to said particular deployment context ~~in which that constraint is to be applied; such that when a run-time solution of the interaction protocol~~

~~is deployed, it can be decided depending on the deployment context whether or not each constraint applies to any document~~.

14. [Currently amended] A method according to claim 13, wherein the deployment context associated with at least one pre-specified semantic constraint is specified in generic terms covering multiple particular deployment contexts ~~messaging constraints are syntactic~~.

Claim 15. Canceled.

16. [Currently amended] A method according to claim 13, wherein the deployment contexts are specified by ~~comprises~~ one or more elements from the set comprising the document, the sender, the receiver, the backend system, the business process and the department.

17. [Currently amended] A method according to claim 16 ~~13~~, wherein the deployment contexts are expressed using Boolean logic between the elements.

18. [Currently amended] A method according to claim 13, wherein the pre-specifying step comprises specifying ~~constrainst~~ constraints applicable to whole classes of objects/processes.

Claims 19-43. Canceled.